

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his further review and consideration of the application, and for his comments as provided in the instant Office Action. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's effort in highlighting the cited reference for Applicant's convenience, and specifically thanks the Examiner in this regard.

Applicant imposes on the Examiner to further consider the following remarks submitted in view of the Examiner's comments provided in the instant Office Action.

35 USC §102(a)

Independent claim 6 is rejected under §102(a) over Silverbrook (WO 03/068517). The Applicant has reviewed Silverbrook, in particular at the portions highlighted by the Examiner, and believes that he understands the Examiner's position with regard to claim 6.

In citing Silverbrook, the Examiner refers to the description at page 4, in which Silverbrook describes that the print head and the ink cartridge may be combined in a single unit. Moreover, the Examiner refers to the description at page 5, in which Silverbrook describes that different ink cartridges with different speed ratings may be provided to "upgrade" a printer. Since, Silverbrook, at page 4, described that the ink cartridge and print head may be combined in a single unit, it is Applicant's understanding that the Examiner is asserting that Silverbrook teaches replaceable/removable cartridges having different performance characteristics.

Applicant concedes that Silverbrook discloses cartridges having different performance characteristics. Applicant however respectfully submits that the cartridges described by Silverbrook are not cartridges comprising a printhead having at least one performance characteristic that differentiates from others in the range.

Applicant in particular emphasizes the focus of claim 6 on the printhead being the item that has different performance characteristics. In the system of claim 6, a plurality of cartridges are provided, and it is the printhead of each cartridge that differs in different performance characteristic from each other.

In contrast, Silverbrook discloses a cartridge in which the performance characteristics of printheads are identical, but the inks of the cartridge have different performance characteristics. The actually-used speed of the printheads are limited by the inks supplied thereto, but otherwise the performance characteristics of the printheads is identical.

Put differently, if a printhead (Printhead A) of a cartridge that contains 4 p.p.m ink were swapped with a printhead (Printhead B) of a cartridge that contains 8 p.p.m ink, Printhead A would now be able to print at 8 p.p.m, and Printhead B would now be limited to 4 p.p.m. That is, Printhead A and Printhead B both have identical performance characteristics. Printhead A would performed identically to Printhead B when provided with the same type of ink.

Applicant respectfully submits that the performance characteristic of a printhead should be judged based on the printhead's response to various situations. If two printheads respond identically to the same situation, Applicant respectfully submits that one must conclude that the two printheads have the same performance characteristics. Conversely, if two printheads

respond differently to the same situation, then one must conclude that the printheads have different performance characteristics.

In Silverbrook, the printhead being fed the 4 p.p.m ink, when instead fed with 8 p.p.m ink, would respond the same as the printhead currently being fed 8 p.p.m ink. With specific reference to Silverbrook, the printhead using the “everyday” ink cartridge would perform the same as the printhead using the “high performance” ink cartridge, if/when the “everday” ink were swapped for “high performance” ink. This point is supported by Silverbrook, at page 5, 3rd last paragraph where it is described that:

“Accordingly, when a “everday” ink cartridge is used the printer has a maximum speed of 4 p.p.m but when a “high performance” ink cartridge is used, the printer has a 8 p.p.m maximum speed.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the above description of Silverbrook supports Applicant’s assertion that the cartridges of Silverbrook use printheads having the same performance characteristics. Therefore, in reciting that each cartridge comprises a printhead having at least one performance characteristic that differentiates it from others in the range, Applicant believes that claim 6 distinguishes over Silverbrook.

Applicant earnestly seeks the Examiner’s opinion and comments on the above point, and looks forward to word of further Official Communication in due course.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia
Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762